



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

this for the benefit of the whole people. As the free schools constitute the paramount idea in our democratic tradition, the participation by all in the give and take of public discussion should be encouraged, not discouraged. The very life of our democracy depends upon that.

THE TASK FOR THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

THE Council of the League of Nations is carrying on; but whether upward or downward remains to be seen. At this writing the fifth session of the Council is meeting in Rome, but its friends recognize its handicaps. It has not been able to perform its chief function of avoiding war, illustrated by the concrete war now on between Russia and Poland. Indeed, we are told that it is not planning even to discuss that war at the meeting in Rome. The Council was unable to avoid the Ruhr Valley incident, which the Germans reasonably claim was definitely the business of the League to avoid. The real international work in Europe is being done not by the League, but by the allied Supreme Council—a war organization dominated by England and France.

European indifference to the League is acknowledged by its friends. As Charles A. Selden, cabling to the *New York Evening Post*, admits, the friends of the League are for the most part convinced that the big questions must be left alone, on the ground that it would be fatal to undertake anything at this time "that would break the League's back." Mr. Selden adds: "They realize and admit that the League has not yet come into its own; that it is having a none-too-robust infancy, and that it is placed in an awkward position by the temporary indifference of the people and the long-continued activity of the Supreme Council."

While it is hoped in Europe that the United States, having retired permanently from the Allied Supreme Council, will eventually come into the League; that the League will continue to do effective and useful work of a non-political, non-controversial sort, thus fulfilling its secondary purpose, all are quite aware of the handicaps due to the marked reactions toward nationalism in all countries, and to the complications of internal politics. An organization without as yet a local habitation, the outlook for the League is not bright. The commonwealths of Europe are concerned primarily, at the moment, with their own political and economic problems, problems producing a profound depression and unrest, as also much human misery. Great Britain has experienced a setback of its hopes in the League, indeed of its hopes in treaties of peace generally.

The Round Table, a quarterly review of the politics of the British Commonwealth, acknowledges in its March number that the American Senate has in its reservations to the treaty expressed the views of all the signatories. Because of the covenant, England realizes that she is now in an equivocal position. She sees that the covenant is both too vague and too precise; that the *freedom* planned for under certain sections of the covenant may be lost under the operation of other sections, providing for *joint action*. As a result of the treaty, the British Dominions have become more self-centralized and less co-operative.

Already there is a growing demand in Britain for a revision of the obligations under the League. Britain believes that her pledges are too strong; that England should do her utmost to guarantee peace, liberty, and law throughout the world, but that this cannot be accomplished by quixotic obligations to foreign States. It is more and more agreed that Britain has assumed under the treaty responsibilities which she cannot discharge; that the time is at hand for her definitely to denounce the idea that the League of Nations may normally enforce its opinions by military or economic pressure upon recalcitrant States. It is argued that the Imperial War Cabinet of Great Britain must go on, and that Britain's action under the treaty must be directed solely by her own judgment. It must be said that these are discouraging facts for the League.

And yet Great Britain will do everything in her power to assist and to develop the simpler mechanisms of international dealing embodied in the League. The same thing is true of France, of Germany, of the United States, and of the rest of the world. In our judgment, the Council of the League should concentrate its attention upon this encouraging fact. In this stage of international development it is not necessary to insist that nations must in the name of international peace mortgage their freedom and judgment of action under an international covenant. Discussion there must be. Mechanism for the development and extension of the discussion, and of the habit of international co-operation, must be provided. An atmosphere of fairness and good-will, too, is indispensable. Great Britain realizes that for the maintaining of peace within her own empire it will be necessary for a "continuous consultation and co-operation by ministers responsible to all the British parliaments." If that is so of the British Empire, it is so of the society of all the nations. If only the Council of the League should see its way clear to turn its attention to the development of its assembly into a periodic conference of all the nations to the upbuilding of international law, and then to turn in and help to develop the work of the Hague conferences into the

International Court of Justice, the League would by such action be in the way of salvaging from the World War the things for which democracy went forth to achieve.

In our judgment, therefore, the friends of the League are right in leaving the war matters to the Supreme War Council, and in taking upon themselves primarily the task of setting up in the name of peaceable settlement those law-making and law-interpreting organs so indispensable to that justice between nations which lessens the chances of war. By eliminating the impossible features of the Covenant and concentrating upon the known and accepted methods of international settlements, the friends of the League may yet render a service to the cause nearest of all causes to the troubled heart of the world.

A COMPULSORY LABOR ARMY

BULGARIA'S INDUSTRIALIZED ARMY deserves attention by students of problems of national policing and defense. It is the child of the brain and heart of Alexander Stambolisky, leader of the Agrarian Party and now Premier, who had the nerve as far back as September, 1915, to tell the then powerful Czar Ferdinand, "If this nation is led into such another adventure as the second Balkan war, there will be heads rolling in Sofia."

His policy now is not one of universal military training, but of universal education. "Instead of officers, teachers"; that is his brief creed. Consequently, against the opposition of the few surviving Royalists on the one hand and the Communists on the other, he is drafting the young men, as they reach the usual age of conscription, for service as laborers instead of as soldiers. Experts will guide them in carrying out irrigation plans in arid districts. Others will reforest denuded mountains. More will be detailed to build roads and highways, school-houses and public buildings. There is to be compulsion, but for social and constructive ends.

Undergoing this labor by day, the conscripts will be taught at night. They will be supported by taxes, but with what different economic results to the kingdom! Production, the world's crying need at this hour, will rise; scientific agriculture and craftsmanship will become diffused; men will be kept in contact with nature, and not live in town barracks and become social parasites. All classes must serve their time, and will thus learn habits of democracy.

The Soviet Government's recent swift shifting of several of the Russian army corps from the rôle of soldiers to that of workers, under strict discipline, engaged in economic restoration of the country, is a variant on Stambolisky's theory.

The United States is suffering today from underproduction, caused to a considerable extent by migration from the country to the city of the workers on the farms, including the youth who went to France, saw London and New York, and cannot be induced to take up agriculture again. Of course, it would be asking altogether too much to expect the enlisted men of our regular army, now at army posts going through the routine drill and becoming parasites of the consuming class, to serve the country as workers, just as the army is being used in Bulgaria. It wouldn't be dignified.

THE PEOPLE AGAINST WAR

IN OUR department of Book Reviews we comment upon some of the important aspects of a posthumous book by the ablest civilian writer this country has ever had on the art, science, and history of war, the late Prof. R. M. Johnston, of Harvard University. He had been selected by the government to assemble and edit the official history of the A. E. F. and he had begun his work at the War College. But the strain of twelve months at the front as an observer on General Pershing's staff, plus his burdens as an author, had weakened him, and he succumbed to an attack that under normal conditions could have been repelled.

It is quite clear from occasional terms used by Professor Johnston that he was of the school of experts who wished beyond all things that they did not have to bow to the will of popularly elected governments chosen by "semi-educated people." With a distinctly Prussian or British note characteristic of imperialism, Teuton, or Saxon, he registered this feeling. But at the same time he recognized the fact that revolutions do not go backward; that it is useless to kick against the pricks, and that the war of tomorrow has to be fought with a new social psychology in mind.

Thus he frankly admitted that an "armed citizen" army cannot or will not support the psychological strain of protracted and negative military operations. Germany found this out to her despair in the recent war. Professor Johnston also understood that the "ordinary citizens of France, Germany, and England (and he might have added the United States.—EDITOR) has had it wrought deeply into his consciousness that it is worse than unprofitable to take the field as a soldier." Hence he believed it "almost certain that in the event of threatening war public opinion will enforce a pacific solution by some means or other. Not for at least a generation to come is it at all probable that the unmilitary west Europeans will permit their governments to get them into the trenches again."

We incline to agree with Professor Johnston, but